

Federal student loan program. Twice in the 1980s, he voted to cut Pell Grants, which he now endorses.

He claims that under his voucher plan, students will be able to go to the private school of their choice. But private schools can decide whether to accept a child or not. The real choice is made by the schools, not parents. The more exclusive the school, the more students will be excluded.

Scarce Federal dollars should not go to schools that can exclude children they do not want. Public schools are already starved for funds. The Dole voucher scheme will inevitably make their plight much worse. We do not have to destroy the public schools in order to save them.

President Clinton and Democrats support true choice—public school choice—where every child has an equal opportunity to go to the school of their choice within the public school system.

President Clinton has been and is a leader in the movement for public school choice, which is supported by a vast majority of Americans. In this year's State of the Union Address, President Clinton said, "I challenge every State to give all parents the right to choose which public school children will attend."

Candidate Dole has it wrong. Education is a national priority that requires public effort and commitment to benefit the entire population, not just the few.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, July 17, the Federal debt stood at \$5,162,069,897,551.43.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,456.14 as his or her share of that debt.

REDUCE THE DEFICIT WHILE PROTECTING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY: ELIMINATE WASTEFUL MILITARY SPENDING NOT REQUESTED BY THE PENTAGON

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, today I rise in opposition to the FY 1997 Defense Appropriation bill. Once again Senate Republicans have sought to include over \$10 billion extra dollars on military projects not requested by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Quite frankly, it is fiscally irresponsible to spend more than is needed on wasteful military programs at a time when many domestic programs are being reduced substantially in order to balance the budget.

At the request of the Republican leadership, the Appropriations Committee has authorized \$10.1 billion more than was requested. That's right. The majority wants to spend \$10.1 billion more than the Pentagon has requested, or than they have indicated they will be able to responsibly use,

next year. Much of that figure was not even included in the Pentagon's 5-year plan, or on so-called wish lists that were solicited by congressional defense committees. The Pentagon has said clearly: They don't need these funds now, the projects are not in their 5-year plan, and they're not even on their wish lists.

Mr. President, there is no question that there is waste in the Pentagon. In fact, about a year ago, the Pentagon's own spending watchdog, its Comptroller General John Hamre, conceded that DOD could not account for over \$13 billion in spending. It's just been lost in the ocean of paperwork at the Pentagon, and likely won't ever be sorted out. In fact, the Comptroller has all but given up on trying to find out what happened to most of the money, arguing it would be more expensive than it would be worth to account for these funds. It is particularly outrageous that the Appropriations Committee has proposed these hefty increases at the same time that the Defense Department is being called to task for not being able to account for billions of dollars in its own spending.

Waste, possible fraud in Pentagon spending, certainly egregious abuses of basic accounting rules—this is a serious problem, and no one seems to be doing very much about it. Indeed, instead of vigorously overseeing spending in this budget, we are trying to foist off on the Pentagon an extra \$10.1 billion in military hardware, new weapons systems, planes and ships, and other spending they have not even requested so that certain Senators can protect jobs in their States that depend on continued high levels of defense spending.

If we pass this bill, my Minnesota constituents will continue to pay their taxes to bolster the treasuries of bloated defense contractors, who are building ships and planes and weapons systems that we don't need, and can't use, and that won't make our Nation any more secure. So that there is no mistake, let me repeat that for those who are listening. We are considering today a defense spending bill that spends a full \$10.1 billion more than the President requested in his budget. We are doing this despite the fact that there is no sudden, extraordinary threat to justify such an increase. And many of those in this body who are pressing for such a huge increase are precisely the same people who are out here on this floor, day after day, week after week, month after month, howling about how we simply must get the deficit under control.

They are doing this while at the same time larding defense bills with billions in spending for their local shipyard, or weapons contractor, or plane manufacturer. Have we no shame, Mr. President? Is there no sense of limits in this body when it comes to wasteful and unnecessary weapons programs? Now, controlling the deficit is important, and I have supported responsible, fairminded deficit reduction proposals

totaling hundreds of billions of dollars. We heard yesterday that the deficit has dropped from about \$290 billion to an estimated \$117 billion this year, due largely to the President's fiscal policies. And now we again are faced with outrageous overspending on military programs that are not even supported by the Pentagon.

For the past couple of years, we've heard from many of our Republican colleagues who have sought to look like they were reducing the Federal deficit through various schemes and non-specific formulas. And even when they have offered something specific, they tend to first go after funding for education, Medicare and Medicaid; programs for those who cannot help themselves; programs which protect our air, lakes and rivers, and on and on.

While I have serious concerns even about some of the President's underlying defense spending assumptions which require, for example, fighting two major regional conflicts at one time without help from our allies, at least his budget focuses on research and development, maintaining a high level of readiness, and improving the quality of life of our Armed Forces. We can meet our defense needs fully and responsibly. My question is, Why aren't we applying the same standards to wasteful military spending that are being applied to domestic programs that millions of average Americans rely on?

There are three arguments that I want to make to counter Republican assertions that the President's defense request is too low. First, the appropriations bill provides more to defense, in dollar terms, than last year. This is in stark contrast to the fact that non-defense discretionary spending as a whole is frozen or declining precipitously in many areas.

Second, Republicans are claiming that defense spending in the bill declines in real terms and as such their budget recommendation is actually a cut from last year. Think about that argument—defense spending is declining in real terms. Now contrast it with the Republican arguments as they seek to dismantle domestic spending programs. Do they ever seek to portray their domestic cuts in real terms? Or do they consistently recite that they are spending the same or more in the current year than they did last year. They can't have it both ways. Pick one methodology and stick with it, I say.

Third, the administration estimates that due to lower inflation estimates over the next few years, we can buy as much for our defense dollar as we had planned, but spend about \$46 billion less for it than was requested last year. By this calculation, the President's budget request actually represents a long-term increase over last year's defense program.

The bottom line is this: The President's defense budget maintains a strong defense, no matter how the Republicans choose to craft their argument. It takes into account all of our

current and future defense needs, and makes tough choices. Adding billions in additional pork barrel spending is unnecessary, wasteful, and wrong.

Even if one acknowledges that defense spending has decreased by some measures since the mid-1980's, and that the administration's request continues that trend, it must be placed into context. That is, much has changed since the end of the cold war. And our country's priorities must change accordingly—we must maintain a strong defense, but accommodate increasing concerns for better education, health care, crime prevention, economy and the environment.

Maintain a strong defense, but do it by increasing burden-sharing by our allies, imposing cost and accountability controls called for by GAO, eliminating unnecessary weapons programs. We must also re-assess the fundamental assumptions which continue to drive continued high defense spending, like the requirement that we be able to fight two major wars at once, without the help or support of our allies.

We already spend vastly more on the military than all our potential major enemies combined—40 percent of the world's total military budget. Along with our allies, we spend about \$510 billion on defense of our interests worldwide. All our major potential enemies combined spend about \$140 billion per year.

The billions spent on star wars, the *Trident*, the B-2 bomber, and the 600-ship Navy are but a few of the reasons why our deficit rose so dramatically during the 1980's. This administration however, has sought to maintain a strong defense while addressing critical domestic needs and reducing the deficit as well. But while the President has made tough choices, the Republicans have refused to stare down military contractors clamoring for even more than the Pentagon has said it needs. If Members are so concerned about a looming procurement problem, then maybe we ought to make some tough decisions about the size of our military forces, and their dispersion around the world, and scale back here. Instead, we are bolstering funding on fantastically expensive weapons programs, while we underfund key peacekeeping programs and the dual-use applications program that will benefit U.S. industry.

I recognize that there are still real dangers out there for which we must prepare, including nuclear proliferation and terrorism. The need to combat weapons proliferation to rogue states poses new problems for the United States, and must be addressed forcefully and directly. But we can do that now. We have the largest and strongest military in the world, and there is nothing in the administration's request that does anything to diminish that fact. To the contrary, the administration's budget improves an already strong defense establishment.

So why do the Republicans persist in adding to the Pentagon's request? Do

they perceive some previously unidentified emerging threat that the intelligence or national security community has disregarded? No. I think at its worst it is simply their desire to pour billions more dollars into spending for large weapons programs, ships, fighters and the like built in the States of defense committee members. At best it is a misplaced desire to save jobs. Mr. President, we cannot afford these kinds of pet projects.

How should we reduce wasteful military spending? I'll start with what arguably must be the most difficult problem to attack—the Pentagon bureaucracy. Several of my colleagues have recently railed against the Department of Energy, the Departments of Education, Commerce and others—but I hear a deafening silence on their part when it comes to the Department of Defense, the largest and most wasteful bureaucracy in the world. The same tough accountability standards should be applied to all Federal agencies, if we are to root out waste, abuse, and program duplication.

Let me give a few examples of the size and scope of the defense waste we're talking about. The General Accounting Office, in a 1995 report on the Defense travel process, concluded that the Pentagon could save hundreds of millions of dollars in travel processing costs simply by following the examples of leading companies. This 1995 study identified a myriad of travel agents, voucher processing centers, and over 1,300 pages of regulations. DOD reported \$3.5 billion in expenditures for travel and perhaps as much as \$1.0 billion more in processing costs. Clearly, efforts to reform and streamline this process, and bring it into control, is urgently needed.

I've already discussed the billions lost due to inadequate Pentagon accounting, so I won't rehash that here. But let's take a look at over \$3.0 billion extra of procurement add-ons that were not even included in the Pentagon's 5-year plan. These items include procurement of four additional F-16 fighters for the Air Force at a cost of over \$107 million. These were not even on the Air Force wish list.

The Army gets an additional \$120 million to purchase 12 more UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters than the Pentagon asked for. In true share-the-wealth tradition, the Navy receives an astounding \$489 million in additional funding for the F/A-18C/D Hornet. The list goes on and on.

The additional construction funds provided for the new attack submarine comes at a time when we're already building the *Seawolf*, after fierce fights by its opponents over the wisdom of building more of these. Why then, are we financing an additional \$700 million for advance procurement of the new attack submarine, which is less capable than the *Seawolf* and only slightly less expensive? To top it off, as directed under the Defense authorization bill, the purchase has preempted any pre-

tense of competition between shipyards by directing these submarines be built in both Connecticut and Virginia.

At the same time that advance and unnecessary procurement costs are added, the bill seeks to reduce by \$150 million funding for the Dual-Use Applications Program that supports development of technologies that can be applied to both commercial and defense systems, thereby reducing the cost of defense systems. Full funding of this initiative would have moved the Nation in the right direction as we seek to reduce Government spending and reliance on single source industries.

Make no mistake; the post-cold-war defense budget is becoming less and less focused on our real national security needs, and more and more on the needs of particular members of Congress to sustain jobs in their home States. American taxpayers are paying for costly, obsolete, fantastically expensive cold-war-era weapons systems that are no longer justifiable, basically to help preserve the political health of certain Members of Congress. That is the sad, unvarnished truth. Many of the weapons systems we are still paying for were initiated during the 1980's defense build-up, and have little or no relation to the changed strategic situation we now face in the post cold-war era. And yet we continue to fund them, terrified that scaling this spending back modestly will cost jobs in our States. This, despite the fact that under the authorization bill we accepted a proposal by Senator LIEBERMAN that calls for a new study to determine the threat as we enter the 21st century. This study will go a long way to determining the weapons systems we will need to address the threat. I'll bet many of the weapons systems we are providing advanced funding for will be deemed obsolete as the results of the study are released.

I believe that at a time when we are slashing budgets for hundreds of social programs that protect the vulnerable; protect our lakes and streams; provide health care for the vulnerable elderly, and create expanded opportunities for the broad middle class—such as student loans and job retraining—it is wrong to provide vastly more military spending than the Secretary of Defense and Joint Chiefs of Staff have requested. We have dramatically reduced or frozen funding for many other non-defense programs, and yet we're pouring even more dollars than the Department of Defense can use into expensive weapons systems.

In defense, as elsewhere in the Federal budget, there are responsible ways to eliminate wasteful and unnecessary spending; by cutting obsolete cold war weapons systems, imposing money-saving reforms within the bureaucracy, and streamlining procurement policy to make the system more efficient and more cost-effective. Over and over, in recent months, I have offered or co-sponsored amendments to address this problem. These attempts have either

been voted down here on the Senate floor, or the bills to accomplish these ends have been bottled up in committee.

In the end, there is little Pentagon streamlining, little elimination of waste provided for in this bill. Instead, when faced with difficult choices between competing weapons systems, basic housing improvements for our troops, and other readiness requirements, the committee decided simply to appropriate funds to buy all of the big weapons systems, ships, and planes that \$10.1 billion could buy, larding the bill with special interest funding for defense contractors, and accelerating purchases not scheduled to be made for many years, if at all.

I believe this bill in its current form spends vastly more on defense than we can afford. The Joint Chiefs and the President agree with me. At a time when we are asked to spend billions less on education, health care, our children and our elderly, I urge my colleagues to vote against these huge and unwarranted increases in defense spending. If it passes, as I'm sure it will, I hope the President will veto it, and then require Congress to come to the negotiating table to more fairly distribute the burden of deficit reduction, eliminating defense pork while preserving our national security.

CENTENNIAL OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President. I take this opportunity to join my colleagues in recognizing the 1996 Centennial Olympic games to be held in Atlanta beginning Friday, July 19, and running through August 4.

The modern Olympics have seen a century of athletes from countries around the world coming together in the original spirit of the games—"international understanding and peace through sports." In 1896, Athens hosted the first modern Olympics, with 13 nations sending 311 athletes. The opening event was the triple jump, which was won by an American, James B. Connolly, after he arrived in Greece only 12 hours before the start. This young athlete led America to win the first title at an Olympic games in more than 1,500 years, when the ancient Greeks last awarded Olympic medals in 393 A.D.

The 1996 Olympic games is expected to be the largest and most widely attended in history. With 197 delegations being represented by almost 11,000 athletes, this games is 40 percent larger than the 1992 Olympics in competitors alone. Over 1,900 medals will be awarded during 271 events in 26 different sports. It is estimated that the between 1991 and 1997 the build-up to the games and the event itself will pump over \$5 billion into the economy.

The Olympics hold a special place in my heart, as I was fortunate enough to represent our country in the 1964 games as captain of the U.S. judo team, a sport offered for the first time that

year. Although I suffered injuries throughout the course of the games, it was an honor to carry the U.S. flag during the games' closing ceremonies. I am thrilled to know that my teammate from the 1964 games and fellow Coloradan, Al Oerter, will be carrying the Olympic flame into the stadium during the opening ceremonies in Atlanta. Al is the only American ever to win gold medals in four consecutive Olympics in the discus. He competing in 1956, 1960, 1964, and 1968.

There is no question that making a serious commitment to a sport at a young age gave my life purpose, channeled my energies, and taught me self-discipline. I was lucky to have had great coaches and mentors to nurture my love of judo and help me achieve my Olympic goals. For all of the athletes who strive to heights worthy of Olympic stature, I commend you. I urge all of you to represent our country with dignity and respect, and the sportsmanship that has brought you to Atlanta.

In particular, I would like to name for the RECORD the athletes representing Colorado. These are a varied group, with unique talents and skills. I join with all Coloradans in saying how proud we are of you.

Mark Coogan, Boulder, marathon; Anthony Washington, Aurora, discus; Rich Weiss, Steamboat Springs, slalom men's kayak; Susan DeMattei, Gunnison, mountain bike; Alison Dunlap, Colorado Springs, women's road race; Juli Furtado, Durango, mountain biking; Jeanne Golay, Glenwood Springs, women's road race.

Ned Overend, Durango, mountain biking; Elaine Cheris, Denver, women's fencing; Rebecca Snyder, Grand Junction, women's air pistol; Eric Uptagraff, Lake Wood, prone rifle; Amy Van Dyken, Highlands Ranch, 50m, 100m free, 100m fly, 400m relay in swimming; Laura Coenen, Peyton, team handball; and Mujaahid Maynard, Denver Greco-Roman wrestling.

I would also like to offer my sincere congratulations to Mr. Todd Riech of Montana. Todd is the only Native American representing the United States in the 1996 games. After overcoming potentially career-threatening injuries, he won his qualifying event for the javelin. Todd is setting an example of perseverance and commitment for all young Native Americans to follow. He is already a winner.

I wish all the best of these and the other athletes representing us at these centennial summer games.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:38 am., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hayes, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1316) to reauthorize and amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act, commonly known as the "Safe Drinking Water Act", and for other purposes, and asks

a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints the following Members as the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

Resolved, That the House insist upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1316) entitled "An Act to authorize and amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act (commonly known as the "Safe Drinking Water Act"), and for other purposes," and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreement votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That the following Members be the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Commerce, for consideration of the Senate bill (except for sections 28(a) and 28(e)) and the House amendment (except for title V), and modifications committed to conference: Mr. Bliley, Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Bilbray, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Waxman, and Mr. Stupak.

From the Committee on Commerce, for consideration of sections 28(a) and 28(e) of the Senate bill, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. Bliley, Mr. Bilirakis, and Mr. Dingell.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Science, for consideration of that portion of section 3 that adds a new section 1478 and sections 23, 25(f), and 28(f) of the Senate bill, and that portion of section 308 that adds a new section 1452(n) and section 402 and title VI of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. Walker, Mr. Rohrabacher, and Mr. Roemer.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for the consideration of that portion of section 3 that adds a new section 1471(c) and sections 9, 17, 22(d), 25(a), 25(g), 28(a), 28(e), 28(h), and 28(i) of the Senate bill, and title V of the House amendment and modifications committed to conference: Mr. Shuster, Mr. Boehlert, Mr. Wamp, Mr. Borski, and Mr. Menendez. *Provided*, That Mr. Blute is appointed in lieu of Mr. Wamp for consideration of title V of the House amendment.

At 11:18 am., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3161. An act to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment to the products of Romania.

H.R. 3166. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the crime of false statement in a Government matter.

H.R. 3756. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the crime of false statement in a Government matter.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3230) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1997, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints the following Members as the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on National Security, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. Spence, Mr. Stump, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Kasich, Mr. Bate-man, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Weldon of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hefley, Mr. Saxton, Mr.